

Application Serial No. 10/675,097  
Office Action dated January 24, 2006  
Response dated April 20, 2006

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-28 have been examined. Claims 9, 10, 19, 20, 27, and 28 have been canceled. Claims 1-8, 11-18, and 21-26 remain. In light of the arguments below with regard to the remaining claims now pending as amended, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims.

### **Drawings**

Applicants have provided herewith a proposed drawing correction with changes proposed to Figures 1 and 4. The Examiner's approval for such proposed changes is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Objections**

Applicants have revised Claims 18 and 26 so as to alleviate the textual problem pointed out by the Examiner. Accordingly, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

### **Rejection Under 35 USC 102(b)**

Claims 1-6, 9, 10, and 13-20 have been rejected as being anticipated by Lemone (U.S. Pat. No. 4,171,765). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants have amended each independent Claim 1, 11, 13, and 21 to clearly claim that the first check word is stored in a write accumulator, the second check word is stored in a read accumulator, and that comparison of the first check word to the second check word is accomplished by way of a compare circuit connected to the write accumulator and the read accumulator. These features are clearly not present nor suggested anywhere within the Lemone reference. Rather, the background section in column 1 of Lemone upon which the Examiner has relied appears to generally describe conventional error detection. Such conventional error detection does not provide for separate read and write accumulators that require no overhead space in the memory area.

Application Serial No. 10/675,097  
Office Action dated January 24, 2006  
Response dated April 20, 2006

In the Lemone reference, the check word is stored with the data block (see clearly elucidated at least at Lemone's Claim 1, part 2) in the data storage device to be retrieved only when the data block is actually retrieved (i.e., when read back by the host system). In the present invention, the write accumulator is external and its contents are never transferred into the memory. In this manner, no overhead space is required in the memory area. The present invention checks data before it is needed and when such data is actually needed, the entire block does not have to be read back. As discussed at page 1, lines 14-18 of the originally-filed Specification, an advantage to checking the data before it is needed is that one can cut over to an independent redundant back-up device before the erred data is required.

As the Lemone reference fails to show or fairly suggest at least the aspects that the first check word is stored in a write accumulator, the second check word is stored in a read accumulator, and that comparison of the first check word to the second check word is accomplished by way of a compare circuit connected to the write accumulator and the read accumulator, Applicants respectfully submit that no anticipation should be found and this rejection should be withdrawn.

**Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)**

Claims 7, 8, 11, 12, and 21-28 have been rejected as being unpatentable by Lemone in view of Katayama et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,388,920). Applicants respectfully disagree. Claims As Claims 7, 8, 11, 12, and 21-28 ultimately depend from one of each independent Claim 1, 11, 13, and 21 and such claims are believed to be allowable as amended, so to are Claims 7, 8, 11, 12, and 21-26 which are pending as dependent therefrom. Claims 27 and 28 have been canceled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection as to Claims 7, 8, 11, 12, and 21-26 should be withdrawn based at least upon the arguments as to patentability made hereinabove.

Application Serial No. 10/675,097  
Office Action dated January 24, 2006  
Response dated April 20, 2006

### CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims as now amended are not shown or fairly suggested by the cited references taken alone or in any combination. Accordingly, the outstanding rejections should be withdrawn.

No additional fee is believed due for this submission. However, Applicant authorizes the Commissioner to debit any required fee from Deposit Account No. 501593, in the name of Borden Ladner Gervais LLP. The Commissioner is further authorized to debit any additional amount required, and to credit any overpayment to the above-noted deposit account.

It is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JARABEK, Andrew et al.

By: 

Dennis Haszko  
Reg. No. 39,575  
Borden Ladner Gervais LLP  
World Exchange Plaza  
100 Queen Street, Suite 1100  
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J9  
CANADA  
Tel: (613) 237-5160  
Fax: (613) 787-3558  
E-mail: ipinfo@blgcanada.com

DRH/dbm